



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/499,819	02/08/2000	Sivaramakrishna Kuditipudi	FORE-57	1785
7:	590 10/08/2003		· EXAMINER	
Ansel M Schwartz			BLAIR, DOUGLAS B	
One Sterling Plaza Suite 304			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
201 N Craig Street			2142	0
Pittsburgh, PA 15213			DATE MAILED: 10/08/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Applicant(s)

Advisory Action	09/499,819	KUDITIPUDI ET AL.
Advisory Accion	Examiner	Art Unit
	Douglas B Blair	2142
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 08 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average in all the second times and the secondition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).</li> <li>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the control of the c</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amo	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension
(2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C		ing date of the final rejection, even if
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF</li> </ol>		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(e):	
<ul> <li>4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>		eparate, timely filed amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • •	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)□ approved or b)□ disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	-· / 01
0. Other:		Lan lly_
		ZARNI MAUNG PRIMARY EXAMINER

Application No.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Though the applicants' claims are read in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. Dacier is considered to teach a topology database having configuation information for reasons stated in the Final Rejection. Motivation for combining the Dacier and Reichmeyer references is also supplied in the Final Rejection.